



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ARTICLE I.

ON THE DATE OF ZOROASTER.¹

By A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON,

PROFESSOR IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY.

Presented to the Society April 18th, 1895.

GREAT men are the children of their age. Heirs to the heritage of the past, they are charged with the stewardship of the possessions to be handed down to the future. Summing up within themselves the influences of the times that call them forth, stamped with the impress of their day, their spirit in turn shows its reflex upon the age that gives them birth. We read them in their age ; we read their age in them. So it is of the prophets and sages, religious teachers and interpreters, which have been since the world began. The teaching of a prophet is the voice of the age in which he lives ; his preaching is the echo of the heart of the people of his day. The era of a prophet is therefore not without its historic significance ; it is an event that marks an epoch in the life of mankind. The age of most of the great religious teachers of antiquity is comparatively well known ; but wide diversity prevails with regard to the date at which Iran's ancient prophet Zoroaster lived and taught ; yet his appearance must have had its national significance in the land between the Indus and the Tigris ; and the great religious movement which he set on foot must have wrought changes and helped to shape the course of events in the early history of Iran. The treatment of this question forms the subject of the present paper.

The Avesta itself gives us no direct information in answer to the inquiry as to the date of Zoroaster. It presents, indeed, a picture of the life and times ; we read accounts of King Vishtaspa, the Constantine of the faith ; but the fragments that remain of the sacred texts present no absolutely clear allusions to contemporary events that might decisively fix the era. The existing diversity of opinion with reference to Zoroaster's date is largely due to this fact and to certain incongruities in other ancient statements on the subject. The allusions of antiquity to this subject may conveniently be divided into three groups :

¹ This paper forms a companion-piece to the present writer's discussion of 'Zoroaster's Native Place' in *J.A.O.S.* xv. 221-232.

- I. First, those references that assign to Zoroaster the extravagant date B. C. 6000.
- II. Second, such allusions as connect his name with the more or less legendary Ninus and the uncertain Semiramis.
- III. Third, the traditional date, placing the era of Zoroaster's teaching at some time during the sixth century B. C.

All the material will first be presented under the headings A.I., A.II., and A.III.; then a detailed discussion of the data, pages 16-19, under the heading B; and, finally, a summary of results, under the heading C, pages 19-22.

SYNOPSIS OF DIVISION A.

- A.I. Classical passages placing Zoroaster at 6000 B. C.
 - a. Pliny the Elder.
 - b. Plutarch.
 - c. Scholion to Plato.
 - d. Diogenes Laertius.
 - e. Lactantius.
 - f. Suidas.
 - g. Georgius Syncellus.
- A.II. Passages associating Zoroaster's name with Semiramis and Ninus.
 - a. Ktesias.
 - b. Kephalion.
 - c. Moses of Khorni.
 - d. Theon.
 - e. Justin.
 - f. Arnobius.
 - g. Eusebius.
 - h. Orosius.
 - i. Suidas.
 - j. Snorra Edda.
 - k. Bar 'Ali.
- A.III. The native tradition as to Zoroaster's date.
 - a. Ardâ-i Virâf.
 - b. Bundahish.
 - c. Albîrûnî.
 - d. Masûdî.
 - e. Tabarî.
 - f. The Dabistan.
 - g. Firdausî.
 - h. The Mudjmal al-Tawârikh and the Ulema-i Islam.
 - i. The Chinese-Parsi era.
 - j. Reports connecting Zoroaster and Jeremiah.
 - k. Pahlavi Perso-Arabic allusions to Nebuchadnezzar.
 - l. Ammianus Marcellinus and Eutychius.
 - m. Nicolaus Damascenus, Porphyry, etc.

A. DATA FOR THE AGE OF ZOROASTER.

A. I. Allusions placing Zoroaster at 6000 B. C.

The allusions of the first group comprehend those classical references that assign to Zoroaster the fabulous age of B. C. 6000 or thereabouts.¹ These references are confined chiefly to the classics, and their chief claim to any consideration is that they

purport to be based upon information handed down from Eudoxus, Aristotle, and Hermippus. Such extraordinary figures, however, are presumably due to the Greeks' having misunderstood the statements of the Persians, who place Zoroaster's millennium amid a great world-period of 12,000 years, which they divided into cycles of 3,000 years,² and in accordance with which belief Zoroaster's *fravashi* had in fact existed several thousands of years. The classical material on the subject is here presented.

¹ So the general classical statements of '5,000 years before the Trojan war,' or the like, although some variant readings 500 (for 5,000) are found. The number 5,000 (6,000) is, however, the correct one.

² According to the chronology of the Bundahish 34. 7, Zoroaster appeared at the end of the ninth millennium: compare, West *Bundahish transl.*, S. B. E. v. 149-151 notes; Spiegel *Eranische Alterthumskunde* i. 500-508; Windischmann *Zoroastrische Studien* 147-165; also Plutarch *Is. et Os.* 47, Θεόπομπος δὲ φησι κατὰ τοὺς μάγονς ἀνὰ μέρος τρισχίλια ἔτη τὸν μὲν κρατεῖν, τὸν δὲ κρατεῖσθαι τῶν θεῶν, ἄλλα δὲ τρισχίλια μάχεσθαι καὶ πολεμεῖν καὶ ἀναλύειν τὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου τὸν ἕτερον· τέλος δ' ἀπολείπεσθαι τὸν Ἀἰὼν.

(a) Pliny the Elder (A. D. 23-79), *N. H.* 30. 1. 2 [Wn. 279, 288], cites the authority of Eudoxus of Cnidus (B. C. 368), of Aristotle (B. C. 350), and of Hermippus (c. B. C. 250), for placing Zoroaster 6000 years before the death of Plato or 5000 years before the Trojan war: *Eudoxus, qui inter sapientiae sectas clarissimam utilissimamque eam (artem magicam) intellegi voluit, Zoroastrem hunc sex milibus annorum ante Platonis mortem fuisse prodidit; sic et Aristoteles. Hermippus qui de tota ea arte diligentissime scripsit et viciens centum milia versuum a Zoroastre condita indicibus quoque voluminum eius positae explanavit, praeceptorem, a quo institutum diceret, tradidit Agonacen, ipsum vero quinque milibus annorum ante Troianum bellum fuisse.* For that reason apparently (*N. H.* 30. 1. 11) he speaks of Moses as living *multis milibus annorum post Zoroastren*. But Pliny also expresses uncertainty as to whether there was one or two Zoroasters, and he mentions a later Proconnesian Zoroaster: *N. H.* 30. 1. 2 *sine dubio illic (ars Magica) orta in Perside a Zoroastre, ut inter auctores convenit. Sed unus hic fuerit, an postea et alius, non satis constat*; and after speaking of Osthane, the Magian who accompanied Xerxes to Greece, he adds: (*N. H.* 30. 2. 8) *diligentiores paulo ante hunc (Osthanem) ponunt Zoroastrem alium Proconnesium.* Pliny's Proconnesian Zoroaster must have flourished about the seventh or sixth century.

(b) Plutarch (A. D. 1st cent.) adopts likewise the same general statement that places the prophet Zoroaster about 5000 years before the Trojan war: *Is. et Os.* 46 (ed. Parthey, p. 81), Ζωροάστρης (*sic*) ὁ μάγος, ὃν πεντακισχίλιος ἔτεσι τῶν τρωικῶν γεγονέναι πρῶτον ἰστοροῦσιν.

(c) The Scholion to the Platonic Alcibiades, 1. 122 (ed. Baiter, Orelli et Winckelmann, p. 918), makes a statement, in substance tantamount to the last one, as follows: Ζωροάστρης ἀρχαῖος ἐξακισχίλιος ἔτεσιν εἶναι λέγεται Πλάτωνος.

(d) Diogenes Laertius (A. D. 2d, 3d century), *de Vit. Philos. Proem.* 2 (recens. Cobet, Paris, 1850, p. 1), similarly quotes Hermodorus (B. C. 250 ?), the follower of Plato, as authority for placing Zoroaster's date at 5000 years before the fall of Troy, or, as he adds on the authority of Xanthus of Lydia (B. C. 500-450), Zoroaster lived 6000 years (some MSS. 600) before Xerxes. The text runs : ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν Μάγων, ὧν ἄρξαι Ζωροάστῃ τὸν Πέρσῃ, Ἑρμοδώρος μὲν ὁ Πλατωνικὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ μαθημάτων φησὶν εἰς τὴν Τροίαν ἄλωσιν ἔτη γεγενῆσθαι πεντακισχίλια. Ξάνθος δὲ ὁ Λυδοὺς εἰς τὴν Ξέρξου διάβασιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ζωροάστρου ἑξακισχίλιόν φησι, καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν γεγενῆσθαι πολλοὺς τῶν Μάγων κατὰ διαδοχὴν, Ὅστάνας καὶ Ἀστραμφύχους καὶ Γωβρύας καὶ Παζάτας, μέχρι τῆς τῶν Περσῶν ὑπ' Ἀλεξάνδρου καταλύσεως.

(e) Lactantius, *Inst.* 7. 15, must have entertained some similar opinion regarding Zoroaster ; for he speaks of Hystaspes (famous as Zoroaster's patron) as being an ancient king of Media long before the founding of Rome : *Hystaspes quoque, qui fuit Medorum rex antiquissimus . . . sublatum iri ex orbe imperium nomenque Romanum multo ante praefatus est, quam illa Trojana gens conderetur* (cf. Migne *Patrolog.* vol. vi and Windischmann *Zor. Stud.* p. 259, 293).

(f) Suidas (10th century A. D.), s. v. Ζωροάστῃς, speaks of two Zoroasters, of whom one lived 500 (read 5000 years) before the Trojan war, while the other was an astronomer of the time of Ninus—ἐγένετο δὲ πρὸ τῶν Τρωικῶν ἔτεσιν φ'.

(g) Georgius Syncellus' *Chronographia*, i., p. 147 ed. Dind., alludes to a Zoroaster as one of the Median rulers over Babylon. Cf. Windischmann *Zor. St.* p. 302, and Haug *A Lecture on Zoroaster*, p. 23, Bombay, 1865.

A.II. Allusions associating Zoroaster's Name with Semiramis and Ninus.

Second to be considered is a series of statements which connect the name of Zoroaster with that of the more or less uncertain Ninus and Semiramis.¹ These references also are confined almost exclusively to the classics, and the difficulty with them is that, in addition to their general character, which bears a legendary coloring, they are based apparently upon a misinterpretation of the name Ὁξνάρης or its variants in a fragment of Ctésias (discussed below), which has been understood as an allusion to Zoroaster.

¹ The date of Semiramis, however, is regarded by Lehmann (*Berliner Philolog. Wochenblatt*, Jan. März, 1894) to be about B. C. 800.

(a) The authority of Ktesias (B. C. 400) is quoted by Diodorus Siculus (A. D. 1st century) 2. 6, for the statement that Ninus with a large army invaded Bactria and by the aid of Semiramis gained a victory over King Oxyartes. See Fragments of the Persika of Ktesias, ed. Gilmore p. 29. Instead of the name Ὁξνάρης, the manuscript variants show Ἐχαόρης, Χαόρης, Ζαόρης. The last somewhat recalls the later Persian form of the name Zoroaster ; and Kephalion, Justin, Eusebius, and Arnobius, drawing on

Ktesias, make Zoroaster a Bactrian or the opponent of Ninus (see below); but Ὀξυάρτης may very well be an independent name, identical as far as form goes with Av. *uḫšyat-ereta*, Yt. 13. 128, and it is doubtless the better Greek reading. The other statements are here given as they similarly come into consideration with respect to Zoroaster's native place. They are:—

(b) Fragments of Kephalion (A. D. 120), preserved in the Armenian version of Eusebius, *Chron.* 1. 43, ed. Aucher: a passage describes the defeat of Zoroaster the Magian, king of the Bactrians, by Semiramis: "*Incipio scribere de quibus et alii commemorarunt atque imprimis Ellanicus Lesbios Ctesiasque Cnidius, deinde Herodotus Alicarnassus.*¹ *Primum Asiae imperarunt Assyrii, ex quibus erat Ninus Beli (filius), cujus regni aetate res quam plurimae celeberrimaeque virtutes gestae fuerunt.*" *Postea his adjiciens profert etiam generationes Semiramidis atque (narrat) de Zoroastri Magi Bactrianorum regis certamine ac debellatione a Semiramide: nec non tempus Nini LII annos fuisse, atque de obitu ejus. Post quem quum regnasset Semiramis, muro Babylonem circumdedit ad eandem formam, qua a plerisque dictum est: Ctesia nimirum et Zenone Herodotoque nec non aliis ipsorum posteris. Deinde etiam apparatus belli Semiramidis adversus Indos ejusdemque cladem et fugam narrat, etc.* Identical with this is Georgius Syncellus (c. A. D. 800), *Chron.* ed. Dind. i. p. 315: "Ἀρχομαι γράφειν, ἀφ' ὧν ἄλλοι τε ἐμνημόνευσαν, καὶ τὰ πρῶτα Ἑλλάνικός τε ὁ Λέσβιος καὶ Κτησίης ὁ Κνίδιος, ἔπειτα Ἡρόδοτος ὁ Ἀλικαρνασσεύς. τὸ παλαιὸν τῆς Ἀσίας ἐβασίλευσαν Ἀσσύριοι, τῶν δὲ ὁ Βήλου Νίνος." εἰτ' ἐπάγει γένεσιν Σεμιράμews καὶ Ζωροάστρου μάγου (Mss. βάτου) ἔτει νβ' τῆς Νίνου βασιλείας. μεθ' ὃν Βαβυλῶνα, φησὶν, ἡ Σεμίραμws ἐτείχισε, τρόπον ὡς πολλοῖς λέλεκται, Κτησία, Ζήνωνι (Müller Δείνωνι), Ἡροδότῳ καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοὺς: στρατεῖην τε αὐτῆς κατὰ τῶν Ἰνδῶν καὶ ἤτταν κ. τ. λ. Cf. also Windischmann *Zor. Stud.*, p. 303, Spiegel *Eran. Alter.*, i. 676-7; Müller *Frag. Hist. Gr.* iii. 627.

¹ This mention of Herodotus might possibly be adduced as an argument that Herodotus was at least acquainted with the name of Zoroaster.

(c) Similarly the reputed work of the Armenian Moses of Khorni, i. 16, makes Zoroaster a contemporary of Semiramis, and calls him "a Magian, the sovereign of the Medes," who seizes the government of Assyria and Nineveh, so that she flees from him and is killed in Armenia. Cf. Gilmore *Ktesias Persika*, p. 30 n, Spiegel *Eran. Alterthumskunde*, i. 682, Windischmann *Zor. Stud.* p. 302, 303, Müller *Frag. Hist. Gr.* iii. 627, v. 328.

(d) Again, Theon (A. D. 130?) *Progymnasmata* 9, περὶ συγκρίσεως, ed. Spengel, *Rhet. Graec.*, ii. p. 115, speaks of "Zoroaster the Bactrian" in connection with Semiramis: Οὐ γὰρ εἰ Τόμυρις κρείττων ἐστὶ Κύρου ἢ καὶ ναὶ μὰ Δία Σεμίραμws Ζωροάστρου τοῦ Βακτρίου, ἥδη συγχωρητέον καὶ τὸ θῆλυ τοῦ ἄρρενος ἀνδρείοτερον εἶναι. Cf. Windischmann, *Zor. Stud.*, p. 290, Spiegel *Eran. Alterthumsk.*, i. 677.

(e) Justin (A. D. 120), in his epitome of Trogus Pompeius' *Hist. Philippic.*, 1. 1, distinctly makes Zoroaster the opponent of Ninus, and says that he was king of Bactria and a Magician : *postremum bellum illi fuit cum Zoroastre, rege Bactrianorum, qui primus dicitur artes magicas invenisse et mundi principia siderumque motus diligentissime spectasse.*

(f) Arnobius (A. D. 297), *Adversus Gentes* 1. 5, in like manner mentions a battle between the Assyrians and the Bactrians under the leadership respectively of Ninus and Zoroaster : *inter Assyrios et Bactrianos, Nino quondam Zoroastrequae ductoribus.* See Gilmore, *Ktesias* p. 36.

(g) Eusebius (A. D. 300), *Chron.* 4. 35 ed. Aucher, has a like allusion : *Zoroastres Magus rex Bactrianorum clarus habetur adversus quem Ninus dimicat*; and again (Windischmann, p. 290), *Praeparatio Evang.* 10. 9, 10, ed. Dind. I. p. 560, *Nínos, καθ'ὃν Ζωροάστρης ὁ Μάγος Βακτρίων ἐβασίλευσε.*

(h) Paulus Orosius (5th century A. D.), the Spanish presbyter, of whose chronicle we have also King Alfred's Anglo-Saxon version, states that Ninus conquered and slew Zoroaster of Bactria, the Magician. See Orosius, *Old-English Text and Latin Original*, ed. by Henry Sweet (Early Eng. Text Soc. vol. 79), p. 30-31 : *Novissime Zoroastrem Bactrianorum regem, eundemque magicæ artis repertorem, pugna oppressum interfecit.* Or, in Anglo-Saxon, and *hē Ninus Soroastrem Bactriana cynning, se cūthe ærest manna drȳcræftas, hē hine oferwonn and ofslōh.*

(i) Suidas in his Lexicon (s. v. *Zoroaster*) assumes the existence of two Zoroasters (cf. p. 4), the second an astrologer : *Ἀστρονόμος ἐπὶ Νίνου βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων.*

(j) In the Snorra Edda Preface, Zoroaster is identified with Baal or Bel, cf. Jackson in *Proceedings A. O. S.*, March, 1894, vol. xvi., p. cxxvi.

(k) In some Syriac writers and elsewhere an identification of Zoroaster with Balaam is recorded, for example in the Lexicon of Bar 'Alī (c. A. D. 832), s. v. *Balaam*, 'Balaam is Zardosht, the diviner of the Magians.' See Gottheil *References to Zoroaster in Syriac and Arabic Lit.*, pp. 27, 30n, 32 (Drisler Classical Studies, N. Y., 1894). Sometimes he is only compared with Balaam.

A. III. The Native Tradition as to Zoroaster's Date.

Third, the direct Persian tradition comes finally into consideration. This tradition is found in the chronological chapter of the Bundahish, 34. 1-9, is supported by the *Ardā-ī Virāf*, 1. 2-5, and is corroborated by abundant Arabic allusions (Albīrūnī, Masūdī, et al.). It unanimously places the opening of Zoroaster's ministry at 258 years before the era of Alexander, or 272 years before the close of the world-conqueror's dominion. According to these figures, the date of Zoroaster would fall between the latter half of the seventh century B. C. and the middle of the sixth century; his appearance in fact would be placed in the period just pre-

ceding the rise of the Achaemenian dynasty. This merits attention also in detail.

(a) The *Ardā-i Vīrāf* 1. 1-5 in round numbers places Zoroaster three hundred years before Alexander's invasion. Compare Haug and West *Arda Viraf* p. 141. 'The righteous Zaratusht made the religion which he had received, current in the world, and until the end of 300 years the religion was in its purity and men were without doubt. But afterwards the foul Evil Spirit, the wicked one, in order to make men doubtful in regard to this religion, instigated the accursed Alexander, the Ruman, who was dwelling in Egypt, so that he came to the country of Iran with severe cruelty and devastation; he also slew the ruler of Iran, and destroyed the metropolis and empire.'

(b) The Bundahish chapter (ch. 34) 'on the reckoning of the years' (to which one MS. adds—'of the Arabs') more exactly computes the various millenniums that made up the 12000 years of the great world-cycle recognized by the worshippers of Mazda. In this period the era of Zoroaster falls at the close of the first 9000 years. He is placed in reality at the beginning of the historic period, if the long reigns attributed to Kai-Vishtāsp and to Vohūman son of Spēnd-dāt (Av. Spentō-dāta, N. P. Isfendiar), may with reasonably fair justice be explained as that of a ruling house. There seems at least no distinct ground against such assumption. The Bundahish passage 34. 7-8 in West's translation (S.B.E. v. 150-151) reads, (7) 'Kai-Vishtāsp, till the coming of the religion, thirty years, altogether one hundred and twenty years. (8) Vohūman, son of Spēnd-dād, a hundred and twelve years; Hūmāi, who was daughter of Vohūman, thirty years; Dārāi, son of Cihar-āzād, that is, of the daughter of Vohūman, twelve years; Dārāi, son of Dārāi, fourteen years; Alexander the Rūman, fourteen years.'

Vishtāsp, after coming of religion	90
Vohūman Spēnd-dād	112
Hūmāi	30
Dārāi-i Cihar-āzād	12
Dārāi-i Dārāi	14
Alexander Rūman	14
	<hr/> 272

The result therefore gives 272 years from 'the coming of the religion' until the close of the dominion of Alexander the Great, or 258 years before the beginning of his power. A repeated tradition exists that Zoroaster was forty-two years old when he first converted King Vishtaspa, who became his patron. If we interpret 'the coming of the religion' to mean its acceptance by Vishtaspa, we must add 42 years to the number 258 before Alexander in order to obtain the traditional date of Zoroaster's birth. This would answer to the 'three hundred years before Alexander' of the *Ardā-i Vīrāf*. If, however, we take the phrase 'coming of the religion' to mean the date of Zoroaster's entry upon his min-

istry (as does West, *S.B.E.* v. 218), we must then add 30 years, which was Zoroaster's age when he beheld his first vision of Ormazd.

A calculation based upon the figures of this tradition would place Zoroaster's birth 42 years + 258 years (=300 years) before B. C. 330, the date of the fall of the Iranian kingdom through Alexander's conquest; in other words it would assign Zoroaster's birth to about B. C. 630. According to the same tradition the duration of the various reigns of the Kayanian dynasty would be about as follows:

King.	Reigned years.	Fictitious date B. C.
Vishtāsp.....	120	618—498
Vohūman (Ardashir Dirazdast) ..	112	498—386
Hūmāi.....	30	286—356
Dārāi.....	12	356—344
Dārāi-i Dārāi.....	14	344—330

The results would be somewhat altered if the computation be made according to lunar years or if a different point of departure be taken. The excessive lengths of the reigns of Vishtāsp and Vohūman seem suspicious and suggest round numbers unless we are to interpret them as comprising successive rulers; for example, in historic times, beside Hystaspes, the father of Darius, we have the names of two other Hystaspes, later connected with the ruling house of Bactria.¹ The historic reigns of the Achaemenians may be compared (cf. Stokvis *Manuel d'Histoire*, p. 107).

Cyrus.....	B. C. 558—529
Cambyses.....	529—521
Darius I.....	521—485
Xerxes.....	485—465
Artaxerxes Longimanus.....	465—425
Darius Nothos.....	425—405
Artaxerxes Mnemon.....	405—362
Artaxerxes Ochus.....	362—340
[Arses].....	340—337
Darius Codomannus.....	337—330

Comparison may be made, as with West,² identifying the long reign of Vohūman who is called Ardashir (Artaxerxes or Ardashir Dirazdast 'the long-handed') with Artaxerxes Longimanus and his successors. Historical grounds throughout seem to favor this. For Hūmāi, West suggests Parysatis as a possibility. The last two Dārāis answer to Ochus and Codomannus, and the reign of Kai-Vishtāsp 'seems intended to cover the period from Cyrus to Xerxes' (West).³ There seems every reason to identify Vohūman Ardashir Dirazdast with Artaxerxes Longimanus, according to the Bahman Yasht (Byt. 2. 17), as this Kayanian king 'makes the religion current in the whole world.'⁴ One might be possibly tempted to regard the Vishtāsp reign as representing the Bactrian rule until Artaxerxes, and assume that Zoroastrianism then became the faith of Persis.⁵ This might account for the silence as to the early Achaemenians and shed some light on the

problem concerning the Achaemenians as Zoroastrians; but there seems to be no historic foundation for such assumption. Suffice here to have presented the tradition in regard to the reigns of the Kayanian kings as bearing on Zoroaster's date and the traditional 258 years before Alexander as the era of 'the coming of the religion.'

¹ See genealogical tables of the Achaemenidae in Stokvis *Manuel d'Histoire, de Généalogie, et de Chronologie*, p. 108 (Leide, 1888); Pauly *Real-Encyclopædie*, article 'Achaemenidae,' Justi *Geschichte des alten Persiens* p. 15, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, p. 398-399, and Smith *Classical Dictionary* article 'Hystaspes.'

² West, *Bundahish translated*, S.B.E. v. 150 n, 198 n.

³ de Harlez, *Avesta traduit*, *Introduction* p. ccxxviii, thinks that the early Achaemenians were intentionally sacrificed. Spiegel, *Z.D.M.G.*, xlv. 203, identifies the first Dārāī with Darius I., and believes that he was misplaced in the kingly list. This I doubt.

⁴ West, *Byt. transl.*, S.B.E. v. 199.

⁵ Dubeux, *La Perse* p. 57, sharply separates the Oriental account of the Persian kings from the historical account.

(c) The sum of 258 years is given also by so careful an investigator as Albīrūnī (A. D. 973-1048). His statements are based on the authority of 'the scholars of the Persians, the Hērbadhs and Maubadhs of the Zoroastrians.' In his *Chronology of Ancient Nations* p. 17 l. 10 (transl. Sachau), is a statement of the Persian view in regard to Zoroaster's date: 'from his (*i. e.* Zoroaster's) appearance till the beginning of the Æra Alexandri,² they count 258 years.' Several times he gives the received tradition that Zoroaster appeared in the 30th year of the reign of Vishtāsp. In another place, *Chron.* p. 196 (transl. Sachau), he gives further information in regard to Zoroaster's time: 'On the 1st Ramaḍān A. H. 319 came forward Ibn 'Abī-Zakarriyā. . . . If, now, this be the time (*i. e.* A. H. 319=A. D. 931) which Jamasp and Zaradusht meant, they are right as far as chronology is concerned. For this happened at the end of the Æra Alexandri 1242, *i. e.* 1500 years after Zaradusht.' From this statement we may compute back to the year B. C. 569 as a date when a prophecy is supposed to have been made by Zoroaster and Jamasp. Albīrūnī is not exhausted yet. In *Chron.* 121 (transl. Sachau), he says 'we find the interval between Zoroaster and Yazdajird ben Shāpūr to be nearly 970 years.' This gives the date about B. C. 571 if we count Yazdajird's reign as A. D. 399-420. Furthermore the carefully constructed tables which Albīrūnī gives from various sources are interesting and instructive, owing to their exact agreement with the reigns of the Kayanian kings as recorded in the Bundahish. Thus, *Chron.* p. 112, 107-114 (transl. Sachau):

Kai Vishtāsp till the appearance of Zoroaster.....	30
The same after that event.....	90
Kai Ardashīr Bahman (Vohūman).....	112
Khumānī (Hūmāi).....	30
Dārā.....	12
Dārā ben Dārā.....	14

On p. 115 he contrasts these dates with those given by early occidental authorities. Finally, *Chron.* p. 32 (transl. Sachau), the name of Thales is brought into connection with Zoroaster. So much for the information furnished by Albīrūnī.

¹ Albīrūnī *Chronology of Ancient Nations* transl. and ed. by Sachau, p. 109.

² According to Albīrūnī p. 32 (transl. Sachau) the *Æra Alexandri* would date from the time when Alexander left Greece at the age of twenty-six years, preparing to fight with Darius.

(d) Of somewhat earlier date but identical in purport is the statement found in Masūdi's *Meadows of Gold*, written in A. D. 943-4 (Masūdi died A. D. 951). Like the Bundahish and like Albīrūnī, Masūdi reports that 'the Magians count a period of two hundred and fifty-eight (258) years between their prophet Zoroaster and Alexander.'¹ He reiterates this assertion in *Indicatio et Admonitio*² by saying 'between Zoroaster and Alexander there are about three hundred years.' Nearly the same, but not exactly identical figures, are found as in the Bundahish, regarding the length of the reigns of the various Kayanian kings; Zoroaster is stated, as elsewhere, to have appeared in the thirtieth (30) year of Vishtāsp's reign and he dies at the age of seventy-seven (77) after having taught for thirty-five (35) years.³ The statement that Zoroaster lived to the age of 77 years is also found elsewhere.⁴ What Masūdi has to say on the subject of Nebuchadnezzar's being a lieutenant of Lohrasp (Aurvataspa) and regarding Cyrus as contemporary with Bahman will be mentioned below, as a similar statement occurs in the Dinkart (Bk. 5).

¹ Masudi (Maçoudī), *Les Prairies d'Or. Texte et traduction par Barbier de Meynard*, iv. 107 'Les Mages comptent entre leur prophète Zoroastre, fils d'Espimān, et Alexandre, une période de deux cent cinquante-huit ans. Entre Alexandre, qu'ils font régner six ans, et l'avènement d'Ardéchir, cinq cent dix-sept ans; enfin entre Ardéchir et l'hégire cinq cent soixante-quatre ans du règne d'Alexandre à la naissance du Messie, trois cent soixante-neuf ans; de la naissance du Messie à celle du Prophète cinq cent vingt et un ans.' Observe especially that Masudi in *Indicatio et Admonitio* p. 327-28) accounts for the intentional shortening of the period between Alexander and Ardashīr. What he has to say on this subject is worth looking up in connection with *S.B.E.* v. 151 note.

² Masudi, *Le Livre de l'Indication et de l'Admonition* (in *Prairies d'Or*, ix. p. 327), 'Zoroastre fils de Poroschasp fils d'Asinman, dans l'Avesta, qui est le livre qui lui a été révélé, annonce que, dans trois cents ans, l'Empire des Perses éprouvera une grande révolution, sans que la religion soit détruite; mais qu'au bout de mille ans, l'empire et la religion périront en même temps. Or entre Zoroastre et Alexandre il y a environ trois cents ans; car Zoroastre a paru du temps de Caïbistasp, fils de Caïlohrasp, comme nous l'avons dit ci-devant.' See Masudi *Kitāb al-Tanbih* p. 90 seq., ed. de Goeje, Leyden, 1894. Compare also Gottheil, *References to Zoroaster* p. 37 (in *Driscoll Classical Studies*, New York, 1894).

³ Masudi *Prairies d'Or*, ii. p. 153 ed. Barbier de Meynard. 'Youstasf (Gustasp) régna après son père (Lohrasp) et résida à Balkh. Il était sur le trône depuis trente ans, lorsque Zeradecht, fils d'Espimān se présenta devant lui (p. 127). Youstasf régna cent

vingt ans avant d'adopter la religion des Mages, puis il mourut. La prédication de Zeradecht dura trente-cinq ans, et il mourut âgé de soixante et dix-sept ans.' The detailed reigns (Masudi *op. cit.* ii. 126-129) are Vishtāsp 120 years, Bahman 112, Humāi 30 (or more), Dārā 12, Dārā son of Dārā 30, Alexander 6 (cf. vol. iv. p. 107 'Alexandre, qu'ils font régner six ans.'). The latter would answer pretty nearly to the commonly received years of Alexander in Persia, B. C. 330-323. Observe that the years of the last three reigns vary somewhat from the Bundahish. Deducting from Vishtāsp's reign the 30 years till Zoroaster appeared and counting simply to the coming of Alexander, the resulting 274 years would place Zoroaster's appearance at B. C. 604 or, if 42 years old at the time, his birth at B. C. 646. But notice that instead of 274 years as here, Masudi elsewhere says (*Prairies d'Or*, iv. 106, quoted above) there were 258 years between Zoroaster and Alexander.

⁴ E. g. Dinkart Bk. 7 (communication from West) and in the Rivāyats.

(e) The period at which the Arabic chronicler Tabarī (died A. D. 923)¹ places Zoroaster in his record of Persian reigns, is practically identical with the preceding in its results, although he occasionally differs in the length of the individual reigns, e. g. Bahman 80 years (although he mentions that others say 112 years), Hūmāi about 20 years, Dārā 23 years. He tells also of a tradition that makes of Zoroaster one of the disciples of Jeremiah. The latter, according to the generally accepted view, began to prophesy about B. C. 626. These points will be spoken of again below.

¹ See Zotenberg *Chronique de Tabari, traduite sur la version persane d'Abou-Ali Mo'hammed Bel'ami*, tome i. 491-508, Paris, 1867.

(f) The Dabistan (translated by Shea and Troyer, i. 306-309) narrates that the holy cypress which Zoroaster had planted at Kashmir and which was cut down by the order of Mutawakkal, tenth khalif of the Abbassides (reigned A. D. 846-860), had stood 'fourteen hundred and fifty years (1450) from the time of its being planted, to the year 232 of the Hejirah (A. D. 846).' If these years be reckoned as solar years, according to the custom of the ancient Persians, and counted from the beginning of Mutawakkal's reign, the date of the planting of the cypress would be B. C. 604; but if reckoned according to the lunar calendar of the Mohammedans (i. e. equivalent to 1408 solar years), the epoch would be B. C. 562.¹ The former date (B. C. 604) recalls the reckoning of Masudi alluded to above, on p. 10. The event of the planting must have been an occasion of special moment; from a reference to the same in Firdausī (translation of Mohl, iv. 291-93, Paris, 1877), the conversion of Vishtaspa is perhaps alluded to. If the conversion of Vishtaspa really be alluded to, 42 years must be added to give the approximate date of Zoroaster's birth. Perhaps, however, some other event in the prophet's life is commemorated.² In any case the results lead us to the latter part of the seventh century B. C. and the first part of the sixth century.

¹ See the calculation of Shea and Troyer, *Dabistan, translated i.* 308 n, Paris, 1843 and Mirkhond's *History of the Early Kings of*

Persia, transl. Shea, p. 281–82, London, 1832. According to E. Röth ‘Zoroastriſche Glaubenslehre’ in *Geschichte unserer abendländischen Philosophie* i. 350, the era of the cypress is B. C. 560. This is adopted by Floigl *Cyrus und Herodot* p. 15, 18 (Leipzig, 1881).

² In case the 1450 years be reckoned back from the date of Mutawakkal’s death (A. D. 860) instead of from the beginning of his power, the numbers would be respectively B. C. 590 (if solar), or B. C. 548 (if lunar).

(g) The figures of the chapter-heading in the *Shāh Namah* of Firdausī (A. D. 940–1020) likewise place the opening of Vish-taspa’s reign at about three hundred years before Alexander’s death.¹

¹ Firdusī *Schahname* ed. Vullers–Landauer iii. p. 1495 seq. See also Shea & Troyer’s *Dabistan* Introd. i. p. lxxxvi and p. 380. Consult the chapter-headings of the reigns in Mohl’s translation of Firdausī vols. iv–v. Observe that Bahman is assigned only 99 years instead of the usual 112; the duration of Vishtaspa’s reign is given in Mohl, vol. iv. 587 ‘cent vingt ans’ in harmony with the usual tradition.

(h) The Persian historical work *Mudjmal al-Tawārikh* (A. H. 520=A. D. 1126)¹ following the authority of the Chronicle of the Kings of Persia, brought from Farsistan by Bahram, son of Merdanschāh, Mobed of Shapur, enumerates 258 years before Alexander.² The Ulema-i Islam counts three hundred.³

¹ See *Extraits du Mudjmal al-Tewarikh, relatifs à l’histoire de la Perse, traduits du persan, par Jules Mohl*. (Journal Asiatique, tome xi. pp. 136, 258, 320, Paris, 1841.)

² Cf. *op. cit.* p. 230. The author acknowledges indebtedness also to Hamzah of Isfahan, Tabarī, and Firdausī. His chronology may be deduced from pp. 330–339 of the work cited; it runs, Lohrasp 120 years, Gushtasp 120 years, Bahman 112, Hūmāi 30, Darab 12 [or 14], Dara son of Darab 14 [or 16], Alexander 14 [or 28]. Observe the alternative figures in the case of the last three numbers.

According to Röth *Geschichte unserer abendländischen Philosophie* i. 351 the author of the *Mudjmal al-Tawārikh* places Zoroaster 1700 years before his own time; on this ground Röth places the death of Zoroaster at B. C. 522, and is followed by Floigl *Cyrus und Herodot* p. 18. Cf. Kleuker’s *Zend-Avesta*, Anh. 2, Bd. 1, Theil i. p. 347.

³ See Vullers *Fragmente über Zoroaster*, p. 58.

(i) Interesting is the fact noticed by Anquetil du Perron,¹ that a certain religious sect that immigrated into China A. D. 600 are evidently of Zoroastrian origin and that these believers have an era which dates approximately from B. C. 559; this date Anquetil regards as referring to the time when Zoroaster left his home and entered upon his mission—a sort of Iranian Hejira.

¹ See Anquetil du Perron quoted by Kleuker *Anhang zum Zend-Avesta* Bd. i, Thl. 1, pp. 394–361; cited also by Shea, *Mirkhond’s History*, p. 282, and by Röth in *Geschichte abendländ. Philosophie* i. 353 and note 566, and followed by Floigl *Cyrus und Herodot* p. 18.

(j) Similar in effect as far as concerns the period at which they place the prophet, although of doubtful value or otherwise to be

explained, are those Syriac and Arabic reports which connect the name of Zoroaster with Jeremiah and which make him the latter's pupil or even identify him with Baruch the scribe of Jeremiah.¹ Presumably this association is due to confusing the Arabic form of the name Jeremiah *Armiah* with Zoroaster's supposed native place *Urmiah* (Urūmīyah).²

¹ (a) The Syro-Arabic Lexicon of Bar Bahlūl (about A. D. 963) s. v. *Kāsōmā* (divinator): 'Divinator, like Zardosht, who people say is Baruch the Scribe; and because the gift of prophecy was not accorded to him he went astray, journeyed to [other] nations and learned twelve tongues.' Cf. Payne-Smith *Thesaurus Syriacus*, col. 3704.

(β) Also Bishop 'Ishōdād of Hadatha (about A. D. 852) commentary on Matth. ii. 1, 'Some say that he (Zoroaster) is the same as Baruch the pupil of Eramya (Jeremiah), and that because the gift of prophecy was denied him as [had been] his wish, and because of that bitter exile and the sack of Jerusalem and the Temple, he became offended (or angry) and went away among other nations, learned twelve languages, and in them wrote that vomit of Satan, i. e. the book which is called Abhastā.' Cf. Gottheil *References to Zoroaster* p. 29.

(γ) Identically, Solomon of Hīlāt (born about A. D. 1222), *Book of the Bee*, 'this Zārādosht is Baruch the scribe,' p. 81 seq. ed. Budge (*Anecdota Oxoniensia*), also E. Kuhn *Eine zoroastrische Prophezeiung in christlichem Gewande* (Festgruss an R. von Roth, Stuttgart, 1893, p. 219). Consult especially Gottheil *References to Zoroaster* (Drisler Classical Studies, New York, 1894).

(δ) Tabarī (died A. D. 923) likewise notices the association of Zoroaster with Jeremiah. According to him 'Zoroaster was of Palestinian origin, a servant to one of the disciples of Jeremiah the prophet, with whom he was a favorite. But he proved treacherous and false to him. Wherefore God cursed him, and he became leprous. He wandered to Ādharbāijān, and preached there the Magian religion. From there he went to Bishtāsp (Vishtaspa), who was in Balkh. Now when he (Zoroaster) had come before him, and preached his doctrine to him, it caused him to marvel, and he compelled his people to accept it, and put many people to death on its account. Then they followed it (the religion). Bishtāsp reigned one hundred and twelve (112) years.' Gottheil *References to Zoroaster*, p. 37. See also *Chronique de Tabari traduite* par H. Zotenberg, i. p. 499.

(ε) The same general statements of Tabarī are repeated by Ibn al-Athīr (13th century) in his *Kitāb al Kāmil fī al ta'arīkh*. See Gottheil *References to Zoroaster*, p. 39.

(ζ) Once the Syrian Gregorius Bar 'Ebhṛāyā Abulfaraj (c. A. D. 1250) calls Zoroaster a disciple of Elijah (mistake for Jeremiah?), see Gottheil *References to Zoroaster*, p. 42.

(η) Similarly the Arab historian Abu Mohammed Mustapha calls Zoroaster a disciple of Ezīr (Ezra), see Hyde *Hist. Relig. Veterum Persarum*, p. 313.

² So suggested by de Sacy *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibl. du Roi*, ii. 319, see Gottheil *References to Zoroaster* (Drisler Classical Studies p. 30 note).

(k) Pointing to a similar era are the Pahlavi (Dinkart bk. 5. and Mkh.) and Perso-Arabic allusions to Nebuchadnezzar as lieutenant of Vishtāsp's predecessor Lohrasp and of Vishtāsp himself as well as of his successor Bahman (Vohūman). In the same connection Cyrus's name is joined with Vishtāsp and Bahman.¹

¹ (a) According to Tabarī (10th century A. D.) and Masūdī, Nebuchadnezzar was lieutenant successively under Lohrasp, Vishtāsp and Bahman; the tradition regarding Lohrasp's taking of Jerusalem is found in the Pahlavi Dinkart bk. 5 and Mainōg-i Khirad 27. 66-67, transl. West, *S.B.E.* xxiv. 64. Tabarī (or rather the Persian version of the latter by Bel'amī) gives two different versions of the story (see *Chronique de Tabarī, traduite sur la version Persane de Bel'amī par H. Zotenberg*, vol. i, pp. 491-507, Paris, 1867), and (Tabarī *op. cit.* p. 503) the return of the Jews to Jerusalem is placed in the 70th year of Bahman. Signs of confusion are evident. So also in Mirkhond (15th century A. D.) who in his history repeats Tabarī's statement with reference to Nebuchadnezzar and Lohrasp, and makes Cyrus a son of Lohrasp although he is placed in the reign of Bahman. He regards Bahman (Vohūman) as a contemporary of Hippocrates (B. C. 460-357) and Xenocrates (B. C. 396-314) which would harmonize properly with the traditional dates above given (p. 8-9) for Bahman's reign. See Shea *Mirkhond's History*, pp. 264, 291, 343.

(3) Masudi is worth consulting on the same point, especially in respect to certain presumed relations between the Persians and the Jews. See Barbier de Meynard *Maçoudi Les Prairies d' Or* ii. 119-128.

(1) At this point may be mentioned two other allusions that place Zoroaster's activity in the sixth century before the Christian era, although the former of these rests upon the identification of the prophet's patron Vishtaspa with Hystaspes the father of Darius. The first of these allusions, that given by Ammianus Marcellinus (5th century A. D.),¹ directly calls Vishtaspa (Hystaspes) the father of Darius, although Agathias (6th century A. D.)² expresses uncertainty on this point. The second allusion is found in Eutychius, the Alexandrine Patriarch, who makes Zoroaster a contemporary of Cambyses and the Magian Smerdis,³ a view which is shared by the Syrian Gregorius Bar 'Ebhryā Abulfaraj (c. A. D. 1250).⁴

¹ Ammian. Marcell. 23. 6. 32 *Magiam opinionum insignium auctor amplissimus Plato, Machagistiam esse verbo mystico docet, divinorum incorruptissimum cultum, cujus scientiae saeculis priscis multa ex Chaldaeorum arcantibus Bactrianus addidit Zoroastres, deinde Hystaspes rex prudentissimus, Darii pater*. The general opinion is that 'saeculis priscis' is allowable in consideration of the thousand years that separated Zoroaster and Ammianus and assuming that Ammianus understood Zoroaster and Hystaspes to be contemporaries, cf. Kleuker *Zend-Avesta. Anh. z. Bd. i. Theil* i, p. 334.

² Agathias 2. 24, Ζωροάστρου τοῦ Ὁρμάσδεως . . . οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ζωροάστος, ἥτοι Ζωράδης (δὲ τῇ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἡ ἐπωνυμία) ὀπρῆκα μὲν ἡκμασε τὴν ἀρχὴν, καὶ τοὺς νόμους ἔθετο, οὐκ ἐνεστι σαφῶς διαγινῶναι. Πέρασι δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ νῦν ἐπὶ Ὑστάσπεω, οὕτω δὴ τι ἀπλῶς φασὶ γεγονέναι, ὥς λίαν ἀμφιγνοῖσθαι, καὶ οὐκ εἶναι μαθεῖν, πότερον Δαρείου πατὴρ εἴτε καὶ ἄλλος οὗτος ὑπῆρχεν Ὑστάσσης.

³ Eutychii Patriarchae Alexandrini *Annales*. Illustr. Selden. interpr. E. Pocock. Oxon. 1658, p. 262-63 *Mortuo Cyro Dario Babelis rege, post ipsum imperavit filius ipsius Kambysus annos novem: post quem Samardius Magus annum unum. Hic, Magus cognominatus est quod ipsius tempore floruerit Persa quidam Zardasht (زاداشت), qui Magorum religionem condidit aedibus igni dedicatus. Post ipsum regnavit Dara primus, annos viginti. Post illum Artachshast Longimanus cognominatus annos viginti quatuor*. On this authority Floigl following Röth wishes to assign the year of Zoroaster's death to B. C. 522, cf. *Cyrus und Herodot*, p. 18, and Röth *Geschichte uns. abendländ. Philosophie*.

⁴ Bar 'Ebhṛāyā *Arabic Chronicon* p. 83, ed. Salhani, Beirut, 1890 (cited by Gottheil, *References to Zoroaster*, p. 33). 'In those days (of Cambyses) came Zaradosht chief of the Magian sect, by birth of Adharbiḡān, or, as some say, of Āthōr (Assyria). It is reported that he was one of Elijah's(!) disciples, and he informed the Persians of the sign of the birth of Christ.'

(m) Finally two other allusions are here added for the sake of completeness, as they have been interpreted as pointing to the fact that Zoroaster lived about the sixth century B. C. There seems to be nothing in them, however, to compel us to believe that Zoroaster is regarded as living only a short time before the events to which they allude. The first is a passage in Nicolaus Damascenus (1st century B. C.), who represents that when Cyrus was about to burn the unfortunate Croesus, his attention was called to *Ζωροάστρου λόγια* which forbade that fire should be defiled.¹ The second item of information is found in such references as represent Pythagoras as following Zoroaster's doctrines.² Lastly, the association of Zoroaster's name with that of Thales, by Albīrūnī, has been noted above.³

¹ Nicolaus Damascenus *Fragm.* 65, *Müller Fragm. Hist. Gr.* iii. 409 *δείματα δαιμόνια ἐνέπιπτε, καὶ οἱ τε τῆς Σιβύλλης χρησμοὶ τὰ τε Ζωροάστρου λόγια εἰσῆγε. Κροῖσον μὲν οὖν ἐβόων ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πάσαι σώζειν. . . . Τὸν γε μὴν Ζωροάστρην Πέρσαι ἄπ' ἐκείνου διεῖπαν, μήτε νεκροὺς καίειν, μήτ' ἄλλους μᾶλινεν πῦρ, καὶ πάσαι τοῦτο καθεστῶς τὸ νόμιμον τότε βεβαιωσάμενοι.* (Latin version) *Persas . . . religio ac metus divinum incessit: Sibyllae quoque vaticinia ac Zoroastris oracula in mentem veniebant. Itaque clamitabant, multo, quam antea, contentius, ut Croesus servaretur . . . At Persae exinde sanxerunt juxta praecepta Zoroastris, ne cadavera cremare neque ignem contaminare posthac liceret, quod quum apud eos ex veteri instituto obtinuisset, tum magis confirmaverunt.* Cf. de Harlez *Avesta traduit*, *Introd.*, xlv, lxvii.

² The principal references are to be found in Windischmann *Zoroastrische Studien* pp. 260-64, 274, from whose work they are taken. Several of these allusions mention Zoroaster's name directly; in others we may infer it, since Pythagoras is made a student of the Magi, whom classical antiquity regards as the exponents of Zoroaster's teaching. Such allusions are: (a) Cicero *de Fin.* 5. 29 *ipse Pythagoras et Aegyptum lustravit et Persarum Magos adiit*; (β) Valerius Maximus 8. 7 *extern. 2, inde ad Persas profectus Magorum exactissimae prudentiae se formandum tradidit*; (γ) Pliny *N.H.* 30. 1.2 *Pythagoras, Empedocles, Democritus, Plato ad hanc (magicen) discendam navigavere*; (δ) Porphyrius *Vita Pythag.* 41 *ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς παρὰ τῶν Μάγων ἐπυνθάνετο, ὃν Ὠρομάζην καλοῦσιν ἐκείνοι; and Vita Pythag.* 12 *ἐν τε Βαβυλῶνι τοῖς τ' ἄλλοις Χαλδαίοις συνεγένετο καὶ πρὸς Ζάβρατον [Ζάρατον, Nauck] (Zoroaster?) ἀφίκετο*; (ε) Plutarch *de animae procr.* in *Timaeo* 2. 2 *Ζαράτας ὁ Πυθαγόρου διδάσκαλος*; (ζ) Clemens Alexandrinus *Stromata* 1. p. 357 (ed. Potter) *Ζωροάστρην δὲ τὸν Μάγων τὸν Πέρσων ὁ Πυθαγόρας ἐξήλωσεν* (Ms. *ἐδηλωσεν*), cf. Cyrillus *adv. Jul.* 3 p. 87 where Pythagoras is called *πανάρστος ζηλωτής* of Zoroaster; (η) Suidas s. v. *Pythagoras, Πυθαγόρας*—*οὗτος ἤκουσε—Ζάρητος τοῦ μάγον* (is it Zoroaster?); (θ) Apuleius *Florid.*, p. 19 (ed. Altib.) *sunt qui Pythagoram aiunt eo temporis inter captivos Cambysae regis Aegyptum cum adveheretur, doctores habuisse Persarum magos ac praecipue Zoroastrem omnis divini arcani antistitem.* (i) In Lucian's *Dialogue Menippus*, § 6, p. 463, the Babylonian Magi are the pupils and successors of Zoroaster *μοὶ . . . ἔδοξε ἐς Βαβυλῶνα ἐλθόντα δεηθῆναι τινος τῶν Μάγων τῶν Ζωροάστρου μαθητῶν καὶ διαδόχων.* Also some others.

B. DISCUSSION OF THE DATA.

The material above collected presents most of the external evidence that we have in regard to the age at which Zoroaster lived. We are now prepared for a more comprehensive view of the subject, for a discussion of the data in hand, for a presentation of certain internal evidences that need to be brought out, and for arguments and possible deductions. Several points immediately suggest themselves for comment.

First, in discussing the classical allusions above presented, one is justified from the connection in assuming that such allusions as are made to the name of Zoroaster as a religious teacher or sage, all refer to the one great prophet of ancient Iran. No account, I think, need therefore be taken of such views as assume the existence of two or of several Zoroasters, belonging to different periods in the world's history. Such a view was held by Suidas (s. v. *Zoroastres*) and was evidently earlier shared by Pliny;¹ it met with acceptance also among some of the old-fashioned writers in more recent times;² but there is no real evidence in its favor, and it is due to an attempt to adjust the discrepancy existing in classical statements with regard to Zoroaster's date. History knows of but one Zoroaster.

¹ Pliny *N.H.* 30. 2.3, *sine dubio illic orta (ars Magica) in Perside a Zoroastre, ut inter auctores convenit. Sed unus hic fuerit, an postea et alius, non satis constat.* He adds a little later (30. 2.8) *diligentiores paulo ante hunc (i. e. Osthaniem) Zoroastrem alium Proconnesium.*

² E. g. Kleuker, *Anhang zum Zend-Avesta*, Bd. I. Thl. 2, p. 68-81.

Second, among the three dates which may be deduced from the material above collected and which are summarized on p. 2, we are justified upon reasonable grounds, I think, in rejecting the excessively early date of B. C. 6000 or thereabouts. The explanation above offered to account for the extravagant figures seems satisfactory enough.

Third, such dates as might be arrived at from the sporadic allusions that associate the name of Zoroaster with Semiramis and Ninus, with Nimrod and Abraham, or with Baal, Bel, Balaam, as above discussed, have little if any real foundation. In each instance there seem to me to be reasonable grounds for discarding them.

There remains finally a comparatively large body of material that would point to the fact that Zoroaster flourished between the latter part of the seventh century and the middle of the sixth century before the Christian era. The material when sifted reduces itself: first, to the direct tradition found in two Pahlavi books, *Bundahish* and *Ardā-ī Virāf*, which places Zoroaster's era three hundred years, or more exactly 258 years, before Alexander's day; second, to the Arabic allusions which give the same date in their chronological computations and which in part lay claim to

being founded upon the chronology of the Persians themselves ;¹ third, to similar allusions elsewhere which place Zoroaster at about this period.

¹ Compare Albīrūnī *Chronology of Ancient Nations* p. 109, 112 (trans. Sachau): and the *Mudjmal al-Tewārikh*, p. 142, 320, 330 (traduit Mohl, *Journal Asiatique* xi., 1841) stating that the account is based on the Chronicle of Mobed Bahram.

Certain objections may be raised to a view based upon this material last given.

First among these objections is a claim often urged, that the traditional date rests upon an erroneous identification of Vishtaspa with Hystaspes the father of Darius. I cannot see, from the allusions or elsewhere, that the Persians made any such identification ; the impression gained from the material presented is rather in fact to the contrary ; one may recall, for example, how widely different the ancestry of Vishtaspa is from the generally received descent of Hystaspes the father of Darius (a point which Floigl and Rōth seem to have overlooked). It was only the classical writer Ammianus Marcellinus who, in antiquity, made any such identification. The point has already been sufficiently dealt with above, p. 14.

A second objection may be brought on the plea that the traditional date (7th to middle of 6th century B. C.) would not allow of the lapse of sufficient time to account for the difference in language between the Gāthās and the Old Persian inscriptions and for certain apparent developments in the faith. Furthermore, that a longer period of time must be allowed to account for the difference between the fixed title *Auramazda*, Ἀουράσδος, current in western Persia in Achaemenian times, and the divided form of the divine name *Ahura Mazda* (or *Ahura* alone and *Mazda* alone) as found in the Avesta, especially in the Zoroastrian Gāthās. This point has been noticed in the interesting and instructive paper of Professor Tiele *Over de Oudheid van het Avesta*, p. 16,¹ who comes to the result that Zoroastrianism must have existed as early as the first half of the 7th century B. C.² If we accept, as I believe we should, the theses that Vishtaspa ruled in eastern Iran, and that, although Zoroaster was a native of Azerbaijan, the chief scene of his religious activity was eastern Iran,³ and that the faith spread from Bactria westwards,⁴ I can not see that these arguments militate against the traditional date under discussion. Dialectic differences between the Bactrian region and Persia proper would sufficiently account for arguments based on language alone. This, added to national and individual differences, might well account for the fixed form of the name *Auramazda* among the Achaemenians as contrasted with the Avestan form. Who can say how rapidly the creed spread from the east to the west and what changes consequently in a short time may have resulted? New converts in their zeal are often more radical in progressive changes than first reformers. Persis, with

its original difference in dialect, may in short time have developed the single title *Auramazda* from *Ahura Mazda* as watch-word of church and state. See also note, p. 20, top.

¹ Reprinted from the *Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde*, 3de Reeks, Deel xi., 364-385.

² Tiele's little work argues admirably for the antiquity of the Avesta as opposed to Darmesteter's views for the lateness of the Gāthās. I wish I could be convinced by Professor Tiele (p. 19) that the names of the Median kings, Phraortes (*fravaši*), Kyaxares (*uvahšatara*), Deiokes (**dahyuka*) as well as Eparna, Sitiparna of the early Esarhaddon inscription (explained as containing *hvaranah* 'glory'), are due to concepts originated by Zoroaster and are not merely marks of beliefs which Zoroastrianism inherited directly from existing Magism. The name of Darius's contemporary Khšathrita (Bh. 2.15, iv. 19, E 9) is not so important for the argument. I confess I should like to place Zoroaster as early as the beginning of the 7th century. The earlier, the better.

³ On eastern Iran, cf. Geiger *Ostiranische Kultur* (Erlangen, 1882) and English translation of same, Darab P. Sanjana *Eastern Iranians* (London, 1885-86).

⁴ See Jackson, *Zoroaster's Native Place*, *J.A.O.S.* xv. 230 seq. So in spite of Spiegel *Z.D.M.G.* xlv. 198 seq.

A final objection may be raised as to the real historic worth and chronological value of the Persian tradition which places Zoroaster three centuries before Alexander. This it must frankly be said is the real point of the question. Is there a possibility of Arabic influence at work upon the statements of the Bundahish and Ardā-i Virāf? Is the whole chronology of the Bundahish and that of the Persians artificial? And did the Zoroastrians intentionally tamper with history and bring Zoroaster down as late as possible in order that the millennial period might not be regarded as having elapsed without the appearance of a Saoshyant, or Messiah?

¹ Spiegel *Eranische Alterthumskunde* i. 506, with Windischmann, regards the data of the Bundahish as 'unzuverlässig,' but it must be remembered that his figures, '178' years for the period between Zoroaster and Alexander, now require correction to 258, which alters the condition of affairs. See West, *S.B.E.* v. 150-151, and Spiegel *Z.D.M.G.* xlv. 203. Compare especially de Harlez *Avesta traduite*, *Introd.* p. ccxxviii.

These questions require serious consideration in detail. The introduction to the chronological chapter of the Bundahish (Bd. 34) does indeed read, according to one MS, 'on the reckoning of the years of the Arabs' (see Bundahish translated by West, *S.B.E.* v. 149), but the word *Tāzikān* 'of the Arabs' is not found in the other manuscripts. Moreover, the scientific investigator Albīrūnī, and also the Mujmal al Tawārikh, whose data agree exactly with the Bundahish, affirm that the dates given for the Kayanian kings are obtained from the records of the Persians themselves.¹ There seems no reason, therefore, to doubt

that the Bundahish really represents the Persian chronology. But what the value of that chronology may be, is another matter. Personally I think it has real value so far as giving the approximate period of three centuries before Alexander as Zoroaster's era. Every student of the classics knows the part that chronology plays with reference to the Magi; every reader of the Avesta is familiar with "the time of long duration;" every one who has looked into the scholarly work of Albīrūnī will have more respect for Persian chronology. Errors indeed there may be; attention has been called above to the lack of agreement between the years assigned by tradition to the reigns of the Zoroastrian Kayanian monarchs and the generally accepted dates of the reigns of Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes; to the dynasty of these three kings there corresponds only the long rule of Vishtaspa (120 years) and a part of that of Bahman Ardashir Dirazdast, some of whose reign answers to that of Artaxerxes Longimanus. As above said, it is difficult to identify the Kayanians of the tradition with the early Achaemenians of Greek history, but this need not nullify the real value of the traditional 'three centuries before Alexander.' What Masūdī (c. A. D. 943) in his *Indicatio et Admonitio* can add on this subject is full of interest. Little attention seems thus far to have been drawn to this important passage and to the explanation which it contains.² Masūdī is fully aware of the difference that exists between the Persian and the generally accepted chronology and he shows how it was brought about by Ardashir's purposely shortening the period between Alexander and himself by causing about half the number of years to be dropped from the chronological lists, but the 300 years of Zoroaster before Alexander were allowed to remain untouched, for the old prophecy regarding the time of Alexander's appearance had been fulfilled. The passage in Barbier de Meynard is well worth consulting.³

¹ See note above, p. 8.

² Cf. Barbier de Meynard in *Le Livre de l'Indication et de l'Admonition* (Maçoudi *Prairies d'Or*, ix. 327-28).

³ See preceding note. I have since found the passage given by Spiegel in *Eran. Alterthumskunde* iii. 193; compare also Spiegel *Z.D.M.G.* xlv. 202.

C. RESULTS.

To draw conclusions,—although open to certain objections, still, in the absence of any more reliable data or until the discovery of some new source of information to overthrow or to substantiate the view, there seems but one decision to make in the case before us. From the actual evidence presented and from the material accessible, one is fairly entitled, at least, upon the present merits of the case, to accept the period between the latter half of the seventh century and the middle of the sixth century B. C., or just before the rise of the Achaemenian power, as the approximate date of Zoroaster's life.¹

¹ Since the above was written Dr. E. W. West writes me (under date Dec. 19, 1895) the interesting piece of information that his investigations into the history of the Iranian calendar have led him to the date B. C. 505 as the year in which a reform in the Persian calendar must have been instituted. He suggests that Darius, upon the conclusion of his wars and during the organizing of his kingdom and putting in force new acts of legislation, may with the aid and counsel of his priestly advisers have introduced the Zoroastrian names of the months which have supplanted the old Persian names which were given in the inscriptions. If this be so, the point may have a special bearing towards showing that the Achaemenians were Zoroastrians. From Albirūnī, *Chronology* pp. 17, 12; 55, 29; 205, 2; and 220, 19 (transl. Sachau), we know that Zoroaster himself must have occupied himself with the calendar. Benfey u. Stern, *Ueber die Monatsnamen einiger alter Völker*, p. 116, regarded the Medo-Persian year as having been introduced into Cappadocia probably as early as B. C. 750. [Dr. West's paper on the Parsi calendar has just appeared in *The Academy* for April 23, 1896.]

Similar results have been reached by others, or opinions to the same effect have been expressed; for example, Haug,¹ Justi (private letter),² Geldner (personal communication),³ Casartelli,⁴ and several names familiar to those acquainted with the field.⁵ Some effort might be made perhaps if the premises will allow it, and some attempts have been made, to define the period more exactly by a precise interpretation of the various time-allusions with reference to cardinal events in Zoroaster's life—the beginning of his ministry at the age of 30, the conversion of Vishtaspa in the prophet's 42d year, the death of Zoroaster at the age of 77 years.⁶

¹ Cf. Haug *Essays on the Parsis* (West's introduction p. xlv); although Haug had previously adopted various earlier eras for Zoroaster, e. g. B. C. 2300 (*Lecture on Zoroaster*, Bombay, 1865), not later than B. C. 1000 (*Essays* p. 299, where the subject is discussed; cf. also pp. 15, 136, 264).

² Personal letter from Professor Justi, dated June 14, 1892.

³ Geldner formerly placed the date of Zoroaster as prior to B. C. 1000 (see article 'Zoroaster' *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 9th edition).

⁴ *Philosophy of the Mazdayasniān Religion under the Sassanids*, p. ii. 'a bout 600.'

⁵ The best collections of material on the subject are to be found in de Harlez *Avesta traduit*, 2e ed. Introduction pp. xx-xxv, ccxiv, Spiegel *E. A.* ii. . . . , and Windischmann *Zoroastrische Studien*; the latter suggested (*Zor. Stud.* p. 164) about B. C. 1000 as Zoroaster's date. The present writer (*Avesta Grammar* p. xi.) once held the opinion that Zoroaster lived 'more than a thousand years before the Christian era.' The date assigned by the Parsi Orientalist K. R. Kama is about B. C. 1300.

⁶ E. g. Anquetil du Perron *Zend-Avesta* i. Pt. 2, p. 6, 60-62, assigns B. C. 589-512 as the age of Zoroaster; compare also Kleuker (Foucher) *Anhang zum Zend-Avesta*, Bd. i. Thl. 1, pp. 327-374; Thl. 2, pp. 51-81. Floigl (*Cyrus und Herodot* p. 18), following Röth, gives B. C. 599-522 as Zoroaster's era and identifies Vishtaspa with Hystaspes the father of Darius. Neither Floigl nor Röth seem to take any account of the difference between the genealogy of Vishtaspa's ancestors as given in the Old Persian inscriptions and the lineage given in the Avesta, Pahlavi, and later Persian works. He does not, moreover, sufficiently take into consideration (p. 17) that 42 years (or at least 30) must be added in every instance to the 258 years before Alexander, as that was Zoroaster's age when Vishtaspa accepted the faith. This would in any event place the date of Zoroaster's birth before B. C. 600.

The above results, if they be accepted in the light at least of our present information on the subject, seem to be not without importance for the history of early religious thought and of the development of ethical and moral teaching. If one carefully works through the material, it must be acknowledged that the most consistent and the most authoritative of all the actual statements upon the subject place the appearance of the prophet at a period between the closing century of Median rule and the rising wave of Persian power, that is, between the latter half of the seventh century and the middle of the sixth century B. C. It is the sowing of the fallow land that is to bring forth the rich fruits of the harvest. The teaching of Zoroaster must have taken deep root in the soil of Iran at the time when the Jews were carried up into captivity at Babylon (586-536), where they became acquainted with 'the law of the Medes and Persians which altereth not;' the time was not far remote when the sage Confucius should expound to China the national tenets of its people, and the gentle Buddha on Ganges' bank should preach to longing souls the doctrine of redemption through renunciation. How interesting the picture, how full of instruction the contrast! And in this connection, the old question of a possible pre-historic Indo-Iranian religious schism¹ comes perhaps once again into consideration.² Certain theological and religious phenomena noticeable in Brahmanism are possibly not so early, after all, as has generally been believed. It may perchance be that Zoroastrianism in Iran was but the religious, social, and ethical culmination of the wave that had been gathering in strength as it moved along, and that was destined in India to spend its breaking force in a different way from its overwhelming course in the plateau land northwest of the mountains of Hindu Kush.

¹ The view strongly upheld by Haug.

² Deductions that might perhaps be made in the light of Hopkins, *Religions of India* pp. 177, 186, 202, 217. Consult especially the suggestive hints of Geldner, article 'Zoroaster,' *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, where the much-mooted question of *asura-ahura*, *daēva-deva*, 'god-demon,' is discussed.

The kingdom of Bactria was the scene of Zoroaster's zealous ministry, as I presume. Born, as I believe, in Atropatene, to the west of Media, this prophet without honor in his own country met with a congenial soil for the seeds of his teaching in eastern Iran. His ringing voice of reform and of a nobler faith found an answering echo in the heart of the Bactrian king, Vishtaspa, whose strong arm gave necessary support to the crusade that spread the new faith west and east throughout the land of Iran. Allusions to this crusade are not uncommon in Zoroastrian literature. Its advance must have been rapid. A fierce religious war which in a way was fatal to Bactria, seems to have ensued with Turan. This was that same savage race in history at whose door the death of victorious Cyrus is laid. Although tradition tells

the sad story that the fire of the sacred altar was quenched in the blood of the priests when Turan stormed Balkh, this momentary defeat was but the gathering force of victory; triumph was at hand. The spiritual spark of regeneration lingered among the embers and was destined soon to burst into the flame of Persian power that swept over decaying Media and formed the beacon-torch that lighted up the land of Iran in early history. But the history of the newly established creed and certain problems in regard to the early Achaemenians as Zoroastrians belong elsewhere for discussion.